

## REMARKS

Claims 3-10, 14-20 and 23-25 are currently pending in the application. Claims 3, 4, 6-8, 10, 19, 20, 23 and 25 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 as obvious over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0131571 (Costin) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,414,693, to Berger et al (Berger). Claims 5, 9, 14, 15-18 and 24 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 as obvious over Costin in view of Berger, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,344,853 (Knight).

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 3-10, 14-20 and 23-25 is requested.

Claim 3 has been amended to recite that over the computer network, the potential customer is provided with a user input for a design element to be included on the object at a first location. As further amended, claim 3 recites that over the computer network, the potential customer is provided with perspective views of the user's selected design element on the object at the first location, wherein the user inputs are adapted to provide at least first and second different perspective views of said object with a selected display element displayed thereon at the first location and viewable in each of the first and second different perspective views.

Costin permits two views (front and back), with the corresponding design element on the front being unviewable from the back, and vice versa. With the cited method, both of two different perspective views of the same design at the same location can be observed by a user.

It appears that the Examiner is modifying the flat (2-D) representations in Costin by using the secondary Berger and Knight references to show that the representations could be perspective/3-dimensional views. However, as amended, claim 3 clearly sets forth that the user can select two different perspective views of the same design in the same location, whereby the design can be seen in both views. For example, the customer will be able to see not only how the design looks when viewed straight ahead, but also how it will appear from a side view.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited prior art at best teaches showing one view or the other, or showing two different views where a design in one location would only be

seen in one of the views, e.g. front or back. The art does not collectively suggest providing two views where the design will be seen from both perspectives, e.g. front and side, where the perspective curvature makes the design viewable both ways.

Accordingly, claim 3 is believed allowable.

Claims 14 and 19 have been amended in like manner to distinguish over the cited art.

The remainder of the claims depend from one of claims 3, 14 and 19 and recite further significant limitations to further distinguish over the art.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 3-10, 14-20 and 23-25, and allowance of the case are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
John S. Mortimer, Reg. No. 30,407

WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ,  
CLARK & MORTIMER  
500 W. Madison St., Suite 3800  
Chicago, IL 60661  
(312) 876-1800

Date: Sept 28, 2006